



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,219	10/09/2003	Jung-Soo Suh	Q76722	8338
23373	7590	04/23/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			SHIH, HAOSHIAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		2173	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/23/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/681,219	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUH, JUNG-SOO
	<b>Examiner</b> HAOSHIAN SHIH	<b>Art Unit</b> 2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/15/2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application amendment filed on 01/15/2008.
2. The previously applied rejection under USC 112 is hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greer et al. (Greer, US 6,993,722 B1).**

5. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 1, Greer discloses a method of controlling input in a host device capable of generating video signals and having a main unit and an input unit, the host device capable of being connected to a display device, the method comprising:

(a) sensing input via the input unit (col.4, lines 35-38; "remote control" issues commands to drive the multifunctional product);

(b) determining output mode of the display device by communicating with the display device (col.3, lines 51-58; output mode is determined to produce best displaying result), the output mode being selected by the user for displaying one of an outside signal among a plurality of outside signals received by the display device (fig.6, "200"; col.4, lines 8-18; a context manager allows a user to select between different output modes); and

(c) processing the input by the main unit according to the output mode after sensing the input from the input unit (col.4, lines 39-45; the key input unit (fig.6 "remote control");

wherein, at the host device, the input from the input unit is one of canceled and executed in accordance with the output mode of the display device (fig.1d, "32", fig.1e, "42", fig.1g, "62"; col.11, lines 65 – col.12, lines 15; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the previous main device when the output mode is of the current main device).

6. As to claim 2, Greer discloses if the output mode of the displaying device is not a mode for displaying the video signal generated by the host device, canceling the input (fig.2b and fig 6 both illustrated controls for mode switching; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the previous main device when the output mode is of the current main device).

7. As to claim 3, Greer discloses if the output mode of the displaying device is not a mode for displaying the video signal generated by the host device, executing the input (when the output mode is a PC mode (fig.1g, "60"), other modes (fig.1g "62") are suspended, and the input commands from the PC are properly executed (fig.1g, "63")).
8. As to claim 4, Greer discloses wherein the host device is a PC (fig.2A, "set-top box").
9. As to claim 5, Greer discloses wherein communication between the display device and the main unit is performed by at least one of a serial and parallel communication (col.10, lines 46; "universal serial bus for communicating").
10. As to claim 7, Greer discloses wherein the input unit is a keyboard (fig.6, a remote keyboard is indicated).
11. As to claim 8, Greer discloses wherein the input unit is a mouse (fig.6, "201", mouse).
12. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 9, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

13. As to claim 10, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 7 above.
14. As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 8 above.
15. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 12, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.
16. As to claim 13, Greer discloses displaying the current mode indicator according to the output mode of the display device (col.10, lines 9-10).
17. As to claim 14, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 5 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. **Claim 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer and Lambrecht et al. (Lambrecht, US 5,754,801).**

20. As to claim 6, Greer discloses the serial communication between the monitor and the computer main unit (fig.2a, "BUS 95"; lines 44-53). Greer does not specifically disclose the communication is performed by an I2C bus/protocol system.

In the same field of endeavor, Lambrecht discloses a serial communication performed by an I2C bus (col.13, lines 34-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Greer and Lambrecht before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the communication bus taught by Greer to include an I2C bus taught by Lambrecht with the motivation being to provide more communication interface options for the user.

21. As to claim 15, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 6 above.

***Response to Arguments***

22. Applicant's arguments filed 01/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

23. Applicant argues that Greer does not disclose the output mode is determined by communicating with a display device.

In response to applicant's argument, Greer discloses that each application has their respective or preferred output mode(s), the host device communicates with the display device to determine the preferred output mode based on the type of the display device (col.3, lines 50-57).

24. Applicant argues that Greer does not disclose that at the host device, the input from the input unit is one of canceled and executed in accordance with the output mode of the display device.

In response to applicant's argument, Greer discloses output modes are associated with their corresponding application devices (col.2, lines 59-63; application devices such as a DVD player or a game device are described) wherein, the host device (fig.2A; set top box) determines the currently displayed output mode with associated application device of the display device and halting operations that are not currently displayed (col.7, lines 30-34).

#### ***Conclusion***

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2100

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAOSHIAN SHIH whose telephone number is (571)270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2173

HSS